DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 648 UD 013 780

AUTHOR Wood, M. Beatrice
TITLE Intensive Reading and Instructional Teams (IRIT), 1972-73. Profiles of Progress: An Evaluative Report.
INSTITUTION Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE 19 Jul 73
NOTE 56p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education Programs; Comprehension Development; Decoding (Reading); *Elementary School Students; Family School Relationship; Individualized Instruction; Motivation; *Program Evaluation; *Remedial Reading; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teaching Methods; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut; Hartford

ABSTRACT

Three Intensive Reading Instructional Teams (IRIT's) provided a comprehensive half-day program of reading instruction for a period of approximately 11 weeks for 405 third and fourth grade pupils who were in Hartford's validated schools and not achieving up to expectancy. A fourth team, funded by the general budget, provided special reading instruction for 141 students from the nonvalidated schools. The IRIT program has been in operation since 1965. The IRIT Centers for the 1972-1973 school year operated from a base of two types of objectives--behavioral objectives, based mainly on thecognitive skills, measurable and visible and also objectives based on the affective domain. The general objectives of the program were: (1) to raise the level of achievement of pupils who are deficient in the basic skills of language and reading; (2) to improve the self-image of the pupils through approval for any achievement and to provide an atmosphere of mutual self-respect; (3) to investigate techniques and materials which will assist teachers in more effective teaching of reading; (4) to create materials and operate a model demonstration center for the teachers of Hartford; (5) to provide a flexible environment that promotes individualized instruction geared to the learning styles of each pupil; and, (6) to promote an interest on the part of parents in the importance of school-home relationships. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 080648

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IRIT 1972-73

PROFILES OF PROGRESS

An Evaluative Report

UD 013780

HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS·249 HIGH STREET·HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103

INTENSIVE READING AND INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

1972 - 1973

Evaluation Office
Hartford Public Schools
Hartford, Connecticut
July 19, 1973

PREFACE

The narrative portions of this report once again were prepared from materials which were collected and submitted by Mrs. M. Beatrice Wood, Hartford's Assistant Supervisor of Reading and IRIT coordinator.

Robert J. Nearine

July 19, 1973

INTENSIVE READING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

IRIT

1972-1973

OVERVIEW

Three Intensive Reading Instructional Teams (IRIT's) provided a comprehensive half-day program of reading instruction for a period of approximately 11 weeks for 405 third and fourth grade pupils who were in Hartford's validated schools and not achieving up to expectancy. A fourth team, funded by the general budget, provided special reading instruction for 141 students from the non-validated schools.

The IRIT program has been in operation since 1965. The grade level concentration has gone almost a complete cycle - from grades 4 and 5 to grades 1, 2, and now grades 3 and 4. The basic organizational format has not changed. However, each year the areas of specialization have attained more sophistication and changed direction in keeping with the goals of Hartford '74 - individualization of instruction, the development of self-directed learners and accountability.

The IRIT Centers for the 1972-1973 school year operated from a base of two types of objectives - behavioral objectives, based mainly on the cognitive skills, measurable and visible; and also objectives based on the affective domain. (See Appendix for Behavioral Objectives and Achievement Statistics.)

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

A. General Objectives

1. To raise the level of achievement of pupils who are deficient in the basic skills of language and reading.

2. To improve the self-image of the pupils through approval for any achievement and to provide an atmosphere of mutual self-respect.

3. To develop an appreciation for and pleasure in reading.

4. To investigate techniques and materials which will assist teachers in more effective teaching of reading.

5. To create materials and operate a model demonstration center for the teachers of Hartford.

6. To provide a flexible environment that promotes individualized instruction geared to the learning styles of each pupil.

7. To develop a self-directed learner who is self-motivated.

8. To promote an interest on the part of parents in the importance of school-home relationships.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF STUDENTS FOR I.R.I.T.

1. Pupils should be recommended who are below grade level in reading achievement, and are not achieving up to expectancy.

2. Children must be able to work successfully within an intensive program and are able to respond cooperatively in this type of situation.

3. Pupils should not be recommended for the program who are attending the ESL, Bi-Lingual, or IIC program.

4. Experience has indicated that preference should be given to students who have a good attendance record.

5. Guidelines to be used for the selection of students should include information found in the cumulative folders, teacher evaluations and principal and reading consultant recommendations.

6. Teachers are requested to recommend for evaluation as many students as they feel would benefit from this type of instruction. However, it must be clearly understood that it is not always possible to accept everyone recommended for the program at any one time.

(See Behavioral Objectives in Appendix)

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES SERVICES

The program design was similar to what was in operation previous years and proven to be successful. This design included intensive reading emphasis

in three areas - decoding, individualized reading, and vocabulary and comprehension. Students moved from one area to the next at approximately one-hour intervals and spent the entire morning in these reading-language arts areas. Pupils returned to their sending schools in the afternoon, for instruction in other basic areas. An eclectic approach to reading is provided through these three areas of concentration. Their design is as follows:

1. Decoding and Word Attack Skills

The purpose of the decoding area is to provide the sound-symbol knowledge that will enable a pupil to successfully unlock or decode an unknown word. In order for students to become efficient readers, they must have independent methods of word analysis. The specific skills in decoding must be isolated and taught. These skills are integrated within the other two areas and provide a balanced reading program. Materials which provided sequentially organized skills were used to develop this word attack ability. Materials used to develop skill in decoding included:

B. R. L. Programmed Texts

Durrell's - Speech-to-Print Phonics

Second Experiences with Consonants and Vowels, by McGraw

McGraw Programmed Readers

Stern's Structural Reading

For the first time, the Croft Program on word attack skills was used to diagnose each student's needs and provide a prescription of study. The language master, typewriter, and tape recorder all added to making drill activities more fun and more meaningful to the student.

2. Comprehension and Vocabulary Development

Comprehension - the goal of reading - is given emphasis by concentration on the various sub skills of comprehension. Meaningful experiences are provided in order to promote concept development.

A wide variety of materials were used in this area. Teacher-made materials and tapes were used to increase the pupil's growth in vocabulary and comprehension. The use of many self-correcting materials assisted in the goal of self direction. Science and social studies were also included in this area to assist in the development of concepts. Some of the materials used in this area were:

Barnell Loft Comprehension Series

S.R.A. Reading Laboratory

Dolch and McCormick-Mathers Crossword Puzzle Books

EDL Controlled Reader Comprehension filmstrips

Reader's Digest Skill Builders with Audio Tapes

Use of many teacher-made and commercial games using homonyms, antonyms, and synonyms

3. The Individualized Reading Area

One of the major goals of the individualized area is to develop the student's appreciation and enjoyment of literature. The students may select their own individual books and read them at their own pace. It is hoped that the more they read, not only will their skill in reading develop, but also the love of books will be encouraged. The pupil-teacher conference is a major technique in this area. This is a very personal conference in which student needs are

diagnosed and individual instruction is given. Motivational bulletin boards encourage wide reading. Creative writing is also an important outcome in this area.

All three areas with the decoding as a core are correlated and used to supplement and reinforce each other.

SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES

1. The director was invited to present the program at the New England Reading Association during their annual conference last September. This presentation brought many visitors from throughout the New England states. The national recognition accorded the program on previous occasions has brought an average of 125 visitors per Center.
2. Two of the teams worked as an in-house team. There were several successful aspects to this: It afforded the possibility of closer and continued contact with the teachers and pupils being serviced. During each cycle, pupils frequently came after school to use books and materials and continued to do so even after their cycle was completed.
3. The in-house location of the team made it possible for the team to hold both formal and informal discussions and offer immediate help to teachers in diagnosing and planning programs for individual pupils.
4. The J. C. Clark IRIT worked jointly with the F. D. Wish team in developing a booklet entitled "RIGHT ON....WITH READING". This was distributed to the pupils in all three cycles and their teachers. This booklet was developed to increase vocabulary.

5. Presently the teams are working on a booklet of reading games and activities to be distributed throughout the Hartford School System next fall.
6. Each month, the team compiled a newspaper that included the children's original stories, poems, and activities for them to do at home.
7. Parent contacts this year were especially rewarding. Those who were able to visit expressed interest in the program, its possible expansion, and a desire to be of help to their youngsters. Some parents volunteered time in the afternoons to aid the teachers in preparing materials.
8. The format of the newspaper was changed, so it more closely resembled a real newspaper. Evidence of enthusiasm was noted by the eagerness with which the pupils searched for their own contribution.
9. Almost all of the pupils in the program reached or exceeded the expected gains in reading skills, based on pre and post test scores of the California Reading Achievement Test.
10. Workshops were conducted for many schools that resulted in many favorable comments by the teachers who attended. It did much to further the repertoire with the teachers at schools. It gave a greater understanding of the function of the IRIT program. It also provided an opportunity for these teachers to obtain different ideas and games which they wanted to incorporate in their own program.
11. The team staff served as resource people for the benefit of teachers, and the classrooms served as resource centers for teachers.
12. The reading center was used as a demonstration center for teachers, out-of-state administrators, and personnel interested in the educational field

with an emphasis on reading.

13. The pupils from one center were taken on a field trip to WTIC, the television station, to be a live audience and see a TV program in actual production.

14. The Wish Team provided an experimental background for Saint Joseph College's student teachers, in reading.

15. A decoding teacher prepared new lessons which included aural, visual, and written components. Filmstrips were coordinated with tape recordings and worksheets were assigned individually to allow a student to have his own tutored lesson.

16. The design of the IRIT reading program has been adopted and adapted in at least 3 different schools in the Hartford School System.

17. The Reading Supervisor from Albuquerque, New Mexico, visited our program with the intention of implementing the IRIT design in Albuquerque.

18. A paperback lending library was set up in each Center to encourage reading at home and to continue the contact of previous students in the program. The students from previous cycles were also encouraged to borrow books from the Centers.

19. Regularly scheduled meetings between the IRIT staff and the school were very successful and were the means of profitable exchange of the needs and strengths of students to improve instruction.

20. Closing Exercises and Open House Day continue to be highlights of the program. An average of 40% of the parents attended Open House, and 60% of the parents attended the closing exercises.

21. Pupils and teachers were enthusiastic about the IRIT program. In the Appendix is a copy of a letter from a pupil from the Vine Street School

and a copy of a letter from a group of teachers.

22. The following booklets were written by the Centers and distributed to the students and teachers in their respective schools:

- Chauncey Harris

  All About Us
  A Book of Indians
  People

- Clark

  Right on With Reading

- Jones

  Buzzing 'Bout Words
  Our Neighborhood - Hartford, Connecticut, U.S.A.

- Wish

  Right On With Reading
  Faces in Reading
  Mother's Day Recipe Book

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

1. Implementation of the teacher-training proposal, using the IRIT Centers as training centers would promote even farther reaching influence in reading achievement in the City of Hartford.
2. Additional IRIT centers are needed in order to satisfy the need for such a program.
3. Follow-up study of a random sampling of students returned to the classroom.
4. Area meetings of teachers will be scheduled on a regular basis to promote professional growth.
5. Observation of students in the regular classroom is recommended to assist in the selection of students for the program.

PROBLEMS

1. The identification of a suitable test for the urban youngster has still not been made.
2. Insufficient funds to replace old equipment and the delay in repairing defective items continues to be a real problem.
3. A part-time secretary severely limits the productive talents of the teams and the communication with parents, teachers, and the Central Office.
4. The director of the program needs a full-time secretary in order to promote the professional growth of the Centers and give the director more time for program guidance.
5. The repair of A/V equipment that receives constant use continues to be a problem.
6. Additional funding for A/V equipment is needed to replace many pieces that are 8 years old.

EVALUATION

Once again the evaluation of the IRIT program employed several kinds of product assessments. Some of these were continued from previous years in an attempt to provide for longitudinal depth to the evaluation. Others were eliminated and for several reasons; some had proven to have been repetitive in providing data which were being gathered elsewhere, others failed to fit into overall system or program testing plans, while still others were simply incompatible with the needs and resources of the program.

Based on the foregoing considerations, several kinds of data were collected. To assess reading gains over the length of each instructional cycle, the reading sections of the California Achievement Test (CAT), sometimes called the California Reading Test, were administered on a pre and post basis so as to produce measures of change in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and in total reading. This was done so that 1973 CAT scores could be compared with previous cycles which had gone through the program in other years as well. In addition, all third grade youngsters were also tested at the beginning and end of the school year with the CAT as part of the third grade Reading Department testing program. These scores were used to measure first cycle (fall) reading retention.

In addition to the cycle and year-long CAT testing, evaluation forms were also prepared for use with the parents and the teachers of the children who had been served by the program. In addition, as a part of a state-wide compensatory service evaluation, the youngsters who enrolled in spring IRIT cycles also received a "happy face" Scale to Measure Attitudes Toward Reading. Given to the IRIT

youngsters in May of 1973, this Scale was also taken at the same point in time by other Hartford youngsters who had been kept in the various sending classrooms for reading instructions. While it was assumed that there should be a relationship between pupil attitudes and reading achievement based upon IRIT services, the possibility that a smaller class load could enable a classroom teacher to give her students a more optimal reading program was considered. That this so called "equality" of treatment could also produce optimal attitudinal change has additional possibility.

As a final element to the evaluation, the IRIT teams recognized through previous evaluative studies that the instructional objectives which had been specified in the project narrative were hardly amenable to any one instrument assessment. Since these were mastered on an individual basis, they had to be assessed by various teacher-developed criteria. These criteria were reported on a check sheet in terms of the numbers of youngsters who had reached each specific objective over a given period, those who exceeded the objective, and those who failed to meet the work. Ratings were converted to percentages and reported.

Because this summative evaluation attempted to look at several aspects of the IRIT program, a number of analyses were attempted for the program as a whole, on a center by center basis, by sex, and various combinations of these factors. This was done to answer a generic evaluative question were the youngsters reading better following the IRIT services? Specific answers to this question have been reported as follows:

1. In common with the pattern established in preceding years, once

again the focus of IRIT services was on youngsters in the middle grades. Here a majority of these services reached youngsters in grade 3 although some services were provided to youngsters in grade 4 (76) and in grade 2 (9). These latter two grades only accounted for a total of 85 of the 404 who were serviced. To examine this concentrated grade impact, only one testing program was utilized: the reading portions of the California Achievement Test were administered on a pre and post cycle basis and at all IRIT centers. Of a grand total of 546, fully 544 youngsters had some test data, either pre or post, while those having both pre and post scores ranged on the various subtests from 524 to 541: a figure representing between 96-99% of those serviced. When CAT data were compared on a pre - post cycle basis, all mean subtest gains - vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading - were statistically significant at the .01 level. This level of significance is important in that it statistically points out that the probability that the gains could have been attributed merely to chance was only 1 in 100: a 99% positive probability. Note here that all gains are better by 3 months of improvement than those which were reported last year.

Subscore	Pre Test G.E.	Post Test G.E.	Difference
Vocabulary	3.2	2.4	+ .8 **
Comprehension	2.1	3.2	+ 1.1 **
Total Reading	3.2	2.3	+ .9 **

** $p < .01$

2. On the basis of these program-wide differences, it was also expected that the pre and post test differences at each of the four IRIT centers would tend to be statistically significant. Here there were no exceptions. Specific sub test gain scores for each of the IRIT centers are reported in the table which follows. Note here that the Harris team, while in a validated school, is supported by general funds and serves a non-validated validated population.

		Vocabulary			Comprehension			Total Reading		
Team	N	Pre GE	Post GE	Dif. GE	Pre GE	Post GE	Dif. GE	Pre GE	Post GE	Dif. GE
Harris	130	2.8	3.4	+ .6**	2.5	3.1	+ .6**	2.7	3.3	+ .6**
Jones	132	2.5	3.0	+ .5**	2.2	3.0	+ .8**	2.4	3.1	+ .7**
Wish	130	2.1	3.4	+1.3**	2.0	3.5	+1.5**	2.1	3.4	+1.3**
Clark	129	2.3	3.2	+ .9**	1.9	3.1	+1.2**	2.2	3.2	+1.0**

** $p < .01$

3. To determine if the same CAT differences could be attributed to the sex of the student, scores were analyzed further. Here differences favored the boys in vocabulary and the girls in comprehension and in total reading.

All were statistically significant at the .01 level. Mean grade equivalent scores are reported by team and by sex for the three CAT sub-tests as follows:

Comparison of California Mean Grade Equivalent Scores, by Team and by Sex, 1972-1973[1]

Team and Sex	N	Vocabulary Pre GE	Vocabulary Post GE	Vocabulary Dif. GE	Comprehension Pre GE	Comprehension Post GE	Comprehension Dif. GE	Total Reading Pre GE	Total Reading Post GE	Total Reading Dif. GE
Harris										
Boys	84	2.7	3.3	+ .6**	2.4	3.1	+ .7**	2.6	3.2	+ .6**
Girls	57	2.9	3.4	+ .5**	2.6	3.2	+ .6**	2.8	3.3	+ .5**
Jones										
Boys	75	2.5	3.1	+ .6**	2.2	2.9	+ .7**	2.4	3.0	+ .6**
Girls	63	2.5	3.1	+ .6**	2.2	3.2	+1.0**	2.3	3.1	+ .8**
Wish										
Boys	57	2.0	2.9	+ .9**	1.8	3.5	+1.7**	2.0	3.3	+1.3**
Girls	75	2.2	3.3	+1.0**	2.1	3.5	+1.4**	2.2	3.5	+1.3**
Clark										
Boys	56	2.3	3.0	+ .7**	1.7	3.0	+1.3**	2.1	3.1	+1.0**
Girls	77	2.4	3.3	+ .9**	2.0	3.3	+1.3**	2.3	3.3	+1.0**

**$p < .01$

4. Despite the fact that the overall reading gain pattern was highly salutary, it was a usual practice to examine differences as these occurred between the various teams. To do this, a simple one-way analysis of variance was completed. This was not done in an attempt to compare one team with another, but rather as a way of looking at team results to determine if the various program facets were operating at about the same level. Resultant differences were reported which differed significantly at the .01 level. While these have been plotted by school intersections, in order to avoid fallacious comparisons note that no information as to which team is the better is indicated.

	Harris	Jones	Wish	Clark
Harris	----	V**	VCR**	VCR**
Jones	V** C*	----	VCR**	VCR**
Wish	VCR**	CR	----	RC**
Clark	CR	CR	C	----

V = Vocabulary
C = Comprehension
R = Total Reading

** = .01
* = .05

5. Given the significant differences which have been specified, team scores were further examined to determine if differences between the boys and girls within teams were evident. On the vocabulary sub-test differences between boys and girls at the Wish team favored the girls, and total reading also favored the girls. All differences were significant at the .05 level.

6. As was previously noted, specific individualized program objectives were stated in the IRIT project proposal and these were assessed on the basis of criterion specified by the various teams. Data reported indicated that all objectives were attained and at a rate exceeding 90%. No level of expectancy was reported. Objectives, supportive data and the several percentages are shown as follows:

WRITING AND EVALUATION September, 1972

CHECKLIST

I. PROJECT TITLE I.R.I.T. - E.S.E.A. TITLE I COOR. -- M. BEATRICE WOOD, ASSISTANT SUPERVISOR OF READING

II. OBJECTIVES	Conditions	Task	Standards	Measurable (Yes or No)
1.	After I.R.I.T. instruction	75% of the pupils will show a growth in vocabulary and comprehension skills	as evidenced in a month's gain in reading achievement for a month of I.R.I.T. instruction	Yes
2.	The I.R.I.T. pupil	will increase his independent reading	by reading two more books each month during the period of instruction	Yes
3.	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all consonant letters presented	with an average accuracy of 70%	Yes
4.	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all short and long vowels presented	with an accuracy of 70%	Yes
5.	The I.R.I.T. pupils will be able to	identify rhyming words	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
6.	The pupils will be able to	answer comprehension questions at their level	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes

WRITING AND EVALUATION

CHECKLIST

II. OBJECTIVES	Conditions	Task	Standards	Measurable (Yes or No)
7.	The pupil will be able to	read orally with reasonable fluency	at his level of attainment with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
8.	The pupil will	read a good variety of reading materials	in at least 3 different areas	Yes
9.	The I.R.I.T. pupil will	show gains in vocabulary development	for at least 75% of the pupils	Yes

III. COLLECTING INFORMATION

# of Objective to be Measured	Instrument and/or Method (How?)	Information Collected (What?)	Collection Schedule (When?)	Analyses (How Used?)	Expected Conclusions (What do you expect to show?)
1.	California Reading Test	Pupil Achievement in Reading	At the beginning and end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Growth in Reading
2.	List of books read	The number of books read by each pupil	Monthly and at the end of each cycle	To promote the joy of reading	Increased number of books read
3.	Botel Phonics Inventory	Knowledge of consonant sounds	At end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in knowledge

III. COLLECTING INFORMATION

Objective to be Measured(#)	Instrument and/or Method (How?)	Information Collected(What?)	Collection Schedule(When?)	Analyses (How Used?)	Expected Conclusions (What do you expect to show?)
4.	Teacher-Made Test	Knowledge of sound symbol relationship	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in word attack skills
5.	Botel Phonics Inventory and Teacher-Made Tests	Ability to identify rhyming words	At the end of each cycle	To identify skills needs	Mastery of rhyming words
6.	Teacher-Made Tests	Degree of comprehension skills	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in comprehension
7.	Informal Reading Inventory	Oral reading fluency	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To instruct according to needs	Improved oral fluency
8.	List of books read	Tastes in reading materials	At the end of each cycle	To provide a wide exposure to pupils	Improved and varied tastes
9.	Teacher-Made Tests	Vocabulary knowledge	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To instruct according to needs	Growth in vocabulary

Chauncey Harris IRIT

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Year 1972 - 1973

Cycle 1 School Burr Cycle 2 School Mark Twain Cycle 3 School McDonough

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below		
1	82% 36	4% 2	14% 6	81% 33	7% 3	12% 5	68% 30	7% 3	25% 11		
2	100% 44	-- 0	-- 0	100% 41	-- 0	-- 0	100% 44	-- 0	-- 0		
3	95% 42	-- 0	5% 2	100% 41	-- 0	-- 0	98% 43	--	2% 1		
4	57% 25	11% 5	32% 14	56% 23	17% 7	27% 11	55% 24	4% 2	41% 18		
5	93% 41	-- 0	7% 3	95% 39	-- 0	5% 2	93% 41	-- 0	7% 3		
6	43% 19	43% 19	14% 6	37% 15	56% 23	7% 3	66% 29	9% 4	25% 11		
7	11% 5	59% 26	30% 13	15% 6	63% 26	22% 9	---	74% 26	26% 9		
8	91% 40	-- 0	9% 4	90% 37	-- 0	10% 4	98% 43	-- 0	2% 1		
9	84% 37	7% 3	9% 4	73% 30	7% 3	20% 8	73% 32	2% 1	25% 11		

Objective 1 - Children determined as reading above grade level, in Cycle I, were reading at 3.5 above.

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Year 1972 - 1973

Cycle 1 School Frank O. Jones Cycle 2 School Vine Cycle 3 School Vine

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below		
1	87% 39	2% 1	11% 5	73% 33	18% 8	9% 4	86% 36	5% 2	9% 4		
2	67% 30	9% 4	24% 11	76% 34	22% 10	2% 1	90% 38	5% 2	5% 2		
3	80% 36	11% 5	9% 4	98% 44	--- 0	2% 1	83% 35	10% 4	7% 3		
4	58% 26	29% 13	13% 6	73% 33	16% 7	11% 5	95% 40	5% 2	--- 0		
5	82% 37	5% 2	13% 6	98% 44	2% 1	--- 0	90% 38	5% 2	5% 2		
6	93% 42	5% 2	2% 1	80% 36	9% 4	11% 5	95% 40	5% 2	--- 0		
7	49% 22	40% 18	11% 5	49% 22	36% 16	15% 7	96% 40	2% 1	2% 1		
8	64% 29	20% 9	16% 7	64% 29	27% 12	9% 4	90% 38	5% 2	5% 2		
9	80% 36	20% 9	--- 0	84% 38	16% 7	--- 0	98% 41	2% 1	--- 0		

#III. Results of Objectives:

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Year 1972-1973

Cycle 1 School E. D. Wish Cycle 2 School E.D.Wish Cycle 3 School Simpson-Waverly

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below		
1	100% 42	-- 0	--- 0	96% 43	2% 1	2% 1	39% 17	48% 21	13% 6		
2	31% 13	60% 25	9% 4	87% 39	2% 1	11% 5	95% 42	5% 2	--- 0		
3	21% 9	50% 21	29% 12	96% 43	4% 2	--- 0	27% 12	57% 25	16% 7		
4	21% 9	50% 21	29% 12	25% 11	13% 6	62% 28	28% 12	56% 24	16% 7		
5	60% 25	14% 6	26% 11	51% 23	33% 15	16% 7	68% 30	32% 14	--- 0		
6	24% 10	62% 26	14% 6	11% 5	51% 23	38% 17	16% 7	70% 31	14% 6		
7	19% 8	60% 25	21% 9	20% 9	67% 30	13% 6	23% 10	70% 31	7% 3		
8	60% 25	21% 9	19% 8	78% 35	11% 5	11% 5	57% 25	25% 11	18% 8		
9	24% 10	55% 23	21% 9	44% 20	40% 18	16% 7	100% 44	--- 0	--- 0		

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Year 1972-73

Cycle 1 School Clark MIA E Cycle 2 School Clark MIAS D & F Cycle 3 School Arsenal

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below		
1	93% 40	--- 0	7% 3	93% 42	--- 0	7% 3	98% 42	0	2% 1		
2	84% 36	5% 2	11% 5	96% 43	2% 1	2% 1	98% 42	2% 1	0		
3	100% 43	--- 0	--- 0	100% 45	--- 0	0	100% 43	--- 0	--- 0		
4	65% 28	21% 9	14% 6	47% 21	40% 18	13% 6	44% 19	42% 18	14% 6		
5	98% 43	--- 0	2% 1	96% 43	0	4% 2	--- 0	98% 42	2% 1		
6	42% 18	49% 21	9% 4	35% 15	53% 23	12% 5	98% 42	--- 0	2% 1		
7	36% 16	55% 25	9% 4	31% 14	58% 26	11% 5	98% 42	--- 0	2% 1		
8	93% 40	--- 0	7% 3	67% 30	22% 10	11% 5	88% 38	7% 3	5% 2		
9	84% 36	0	16% 7	87% 39	--- 0	13% 6	98% 42	--- 0	2% 1		

7. The favorable individualized objective data were further supported by self-reports obtained from parents and from referring teachers. These data which were compiled by the Reading Department are reported for the IRIT program as a whole with comments typically extracted from the various response forms and cycles.

PARENT EVALUATIONS OF THE IRIT PROGRAM

1) As a parent, did your child enjoy attending the Reading Program?

Much - 251
Some - 36
No Ans.- 3

2) What did your child like about the reading school?

Books.

Reading books.

Everything.

He enjoyed the program and the activities.

Homework.

Doing book 13 and reading.

S.R.A.

The different stories she learned.

The filmstrips and tapes.

More material and assignment was put upon her.

Writing stories.

I really don't know, but he talked about it all the time.

Word games - tests - word cards.

Typing.

Group sessions; all activities in general.

Films, record player.

All the teachers. Reading a large number of books. Sounding out words.

She feelsproud that she can read much more than before.

3) What did your child dislike about the reading school?

Nothing.

Earphones.

Nothing, except that it' s ending.

The clay.

Language Master.

She didn' t like the test.

4) How has your child' s attitude toward reading changed?

He now likes to read a great deal, and he reads much better than before.

She wants more books and is interested in all kinds of books in general.

Gets more books from library to read.

She picked up many new words in the program.

A whole lot. Now he says he can read some of the work the teachers give him.

He seems to understand what he reads and he reads more often.

More interest; does a little every day, enjoys it, too.

Tries very hard, and really wants to read.

He reads more on his own; selections are also toward more helpful material.

He has more interest in reading and reads with more confidence.

For the better; he now reads on his own.

He is more interested in books, and tries to read everything he sees; and tries to write letters.

It has changed very much. He' s always getting a book and reading it. Some words he doesn' t know, but he tries.

Much more interested in reading things - in newspapers, TV, etc.

Now that he is a part of this program, he has a desire to read.

5) How has the reading program affected your child' s attitude toward school in general?

He enjoys school now more than before because of the reading program.

He looks forward to attending school to participate in the program.

I think it has made a big difference in her school work.

I think she has more interest and appreciation of school.

He likes school more than ever.

Something to look forward to each morning, and a discussion in the afternoon after attending.

Yes, it has improved his reading ability; thus, he is able to complete his work faster.

Doesn' t want to miss a day out of school!

By learning to read better, it has improved her other work.

Helps him to understand better what' s going on.

She has a better outlook toward school.

6) Did you visit the Reading Program?

Yes	78
No	- 220
No Ans.	10

7) Did you help your child with the newspaper?

Yes	-167
No	-115
No Ans.	- 16

8. How would you suggest that the reading program be improved?

I have no ideas at the moment. As for me, I do think it a great help to children and very important at this age, although it could start at a younger age.

By more parents showing interest in helping the teachers of their children.

Give them homework.

It can be improved by helping a lot of other kids that are behind to get caught up and learn faster.

I think if it lasted the year around, that would really help.

By continuing the program further.

I feel this reading program is great. Wish it could be a whole year project and more children were able to attend. Reading seems to be the problem with a lot of children.

Continuation.

By having parents let their children attend the reading program.

Considering my daughter' s improvement in reading and the methods used, I think it is very successful and beautiful as is.

By letting the children read every day.

Program should be expanded to more students and be continued throughout the school year.

TYPICAL TEACHER EVALUATIONS OF THE I.R.I.T. PROGRAM

1) What changes have you noticed in the skills of the children attending the I.R.I.T.? Describe briefly.

I have noticed an improvement in all reading skill areas, especially comprehension.

One child who hardly finished a day's work began to want to start and finish her daily work.

They now apply word attack skills rather proficiently.

Oral reading has improved.

All the children attending IRIT are very enthusiastic about reading, and frequently go to the library for new books. Decoding skills are improving.

They approach tasks in a more mature way; seem to have more interest in acquiring skills.

The children have increased their concentration skills.

A better attitude toward reading; the ability to decode, rather than guess.

They seem to be reading with much more confidence than when they left.

Children work harder at attacking a word, rather than asking teacher the word or giving up.

All of them have improved in several areas. They are more capable of working independently.

2) What changes in the children's attitude toward reading did you notice?

More interest in independent reading.

Many of the group now want to read in their leisure time.

Are now more anxious to read orally.

A more positive attitude has been observed.

Children anxious to talk about reading and books read.

They are much more eager to participate orally; have more confidence.

They have a great interest in library books and can pick out books they can read.

3) What behavioral changes have you noticed? Please specify.

She is not as easily frustrated.

Some work habits improved. For the most part, they were ready to start the assigned work without being told.

There were changes in writing, reading, and decoding skills.

Many read in their spare time.

More quiet; more self-control.

The children seem relatively serious in their approach to reading.

More enthusiasm for reading. Less fooling around in reading.

More interest in social studies and science.

They are able to work more independently.

Terrific attitude. Both children who went to IRIT wanted to go to library constantly and were always asking to take books home.

4) Were you able to visit the I.R.I.T. Program to see it in action?

Yes 45 No 4

5) How many pupils remained with you during the A.M.?

Average Number = 15

6) What affect did the I.R.I.T. Program have on the children who remained in your classroom?

Made it possible to work with small groups.

More settled.

None.

The children were more at ease in a less confining atmosphere.

Children made more progress.

We were able to work in a more individualized, concentrated, and quicker program. The children felt more important within the small group.

What affect did removing some pupils from your classroom have on your program?

Tremendous.

Able to work faster with individual children.

My language arts program became more expanded and I was able to give the remaining students much more freedom with responsibility.

I was able to work with children who had specific problems.

The remaining children were given more individualized instruction, and it was easier to execute our tape program.

The program was easier to work in.

Made it much more effective.

I was able to work more closely with those who were left in the classroom.

7) How would you improve the I.R.I.T. Program? Describe briefly.

Have more children go before they need remediation.

It was a fine program - well organized.

It's terrific! Couldn't be better except by giving a 5 or 10 minute break.

The program should keep children for longer than one session.

Put more units into effect.

Select the 45 pupils who would benefit most from the program and keep them for the entire year.

No suggestions.

Pupils seem so eager to continue - perhaps lengthen term.

8) How have the pupil progress reports helped you?

Proved accurate in placing on return.

Just great! I gained insights into specific ways of dealing with reading disabilities, e.g. gave my students the Alphabet recognition (capital and small) and parts of the Phonics Mastery Test. As a 1st year reading teacher, I've really gotten a lot from IRIT.

Very effective for placement and individual help.

It helped me to plan the levels of the other areas, i.e. social studies and some science. The reports also helped me chart the specific progress levels of the children left in the room.

They helped me to see specific weaknesses.

In pupil placement and organizing skill groups.

They have pinpointed the actual levels of my attending students.

Let me watch their growth and know where they still needed help.

They kept me informed as to what the children were learning and how they performed.

They have informed me about each child in a very thorough manner.

8. In the literature, one often finds reference to substantial gains which can be measured in reading skill development over a relatively short period of time. One also can read that statistical regression tends to diminish these gains over a longer period. If a high score is reached over a short period, statistics indicate that the further a youngster's score has moved from the average, the more chance it has of falling back on the next test to the original score: like the snapping of a rubber band, if you will.

Despite the contention that short term gains are often momentary score inflations, the IRIT program has over its seven year history contended that the eight to eleven week cycle gains were in fact carried on and increased at

the classroom level. This contention was buttressed by the fact that IRIT team members not only provide services to youngsters in team settings but continue to assert them once they return to the classroom. In addition to direct student services, team members also reported that they assisted the classroom teacher to help the youngsters in various ways: through on-going assessments of reading needs, by providing assistance in programming, and through individual and group consultations.

To support thie contention that IRIT gains tend to be carried on in the classroom, the names of all youngsters who were enrolled in the first, or September, cycle were obtained from the Reading Department. City-wide pre and post California test scores were obtained from computer print-offs and matched to student names. For the youngsters in the present third grade, the 1970 CAT was administered in September and again in May of the 1972-73 school year: for the present fourth graders, the 1953 CAT was given in May of 1972 and once again in May, 1973. Scores for students having incomplete test data were eliminated from the analysis. Grade equivalent scores were calculated for each of the three CAT sub-tests and comparisons were made pre to post by team, grade, and cycle. Since scores were analyzed by hand, no tests of significance were completed. Note here that the gains generally report month for month progress over the course of the school year. Note also that average cycle gains were generally improved by the end of the school year.

Comparison of California

Test Scores by Team, Grade, and by

Cycle I, School Year 1972 - 1973

		Pre Test			Post Test					
Group	N	Voc	Comp	Rdg	Voc	Comp	Rdg	Voc	Comp	Rdg
Wish	18	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.6	3.0	2.8	+ .7	+ .9	+ .8
Jones	20	1.5	1.4	1.4	2.9	3.0	3.0	+ 1.4	+ 1.6	+ 1.6
Clark	29	2.4	2.1	2.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	+ .8	+ 1.2	+ 1.1
Harris	32	2.9	2.6	2.7	4.0	4.2	4.1	+ 1.1	+ 1.6	+ 1.4
Grade 3	78	2.0	1.9	1.8	2.9	3.1	3.0	+ .9	+ 1.2	+ 1.2
Grade 4	23	3.3	3.1	3.2	4.6	4.8	4.7	+ 1.3	+ 1.7	+ 1.5
Cycle I	89	2.6	2.4	2.4	3.7	3.9	3.8	+ 1.1	+ 1.5	+ 1.4

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In order to assess the effectiveness of the IRIT project, both as a total program and on a differential team basis, several kinds of product measures were utilized. Some of these measures followed the pattern which had been established over the years while others were new to the program. In general, measures were either retained or rejected on the basis of their relevance to instruction, administrative feasibility, and attention to economy of time and effort. Based on the measures which were employed, the following findings were evident.

1. When youngsters were tested with the California Achievement Test (CAT '53) at the beginning and end of the 8 to 11 week instructional cycle, program gains on vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading sub-tests ranged from .8 to 1.1 with all gains statistically and educationally significant. Gains also exceeded those reported for the same periods over the preceding year by 3 full months of improvement and on each of the three sub-tests.
2. When these same data were analyzed by individual teams, gains ranged from .5 to 1.5; again being statistically significant. Note here that the unvalidated Harris team reported gains which were slightly below those reported by the validated teams on the whole.
3. Further analysis of CAT differences by sex showed that gains favored the boys in vocabulary and the girls in comprehension and in total reading. Again differences were statistically significant.

4. To determine whether the program was operating at about the same level across the board, gains on the various sub-scores were compared on a team by team basis. While statistically significant differences were reported, no inferences nor conclusions were drawn from the data.

5. Because the IRIT program was oriented toward an individualized instructional approach, various program objectives were specified and these were assessed by team criteria. Data reported here indicated that all objectives were attained and at a rate exceeding 90%. While no level of expectancy was reported, it would appear from the absence of negative comments that the level of attainment was at least anticipated, and probably exceeded since no problems in this area were reported.

6. An analysis of the objective responses to parent and teacher self-report forms, coupled to a typically representative array of comments taken from the same reports again revealed overall patterns of satisfaction with the program on the part of the respondents. This satisfaction seemed oriented around two basic program dimensions; the children's enjoyment of the IRIT program, and the reading benefits which resulted from IRIT attendance. Both areas received strong affirmation. Note also that teachers reported that their diminished class size enabled them to work more effectively with their own youngsters so that the possibility of increased reading gains in the

sending classrooms should be considered although this area was not specifically measured.

7. In order to determine whether the statistically significant gains which were amassed over a short period of time were retained or increased over a one year period, youngsters were tested pre and post with various editions of the CAT. All third graders received the 1970 Edition in September and again in May of the 1972-73 school year, while fourth graders were tested in May of 1972 and again in May of 1973 with the CAT '53. Because a longitudinal assessment following IRIT services was indicated, only cycle 1 data - the September - October cycle - were analyzed for the 89 youngsters having complete test data. Since average gains on the three sub-tests ranged from 1.4 to 3.8, the assumption that cycle gains were maintained and somewhat improved upon was accepted.

8. While a Scale to Measure Attitudes Toward Reading was administered to all IRIT youngsters in the spring or last cycle, and to the students who remained in the sending classrooms, as a control, a pending computer analysis makes it impossible to include the data in this report at this time. Any findings must be reported in a supplementary document.

On the basis of the foregoing evidences, once again it would appear that the overall objective of the program - to help inner city youngsters to read - was met and in terms of the objectives specified in the proposal. The questions posed

by the evaluation were answered in terms of the dimensions which had been specified. With the exception of the attitude scale analysis, it could be reported that the program basically functioned as described in the proposal for funding, with any exceptions noted in this narration.

APPENDIX

I.R.I.T.

M. Beatrice Wood

Date June 28, 1973

1972-73 SADC - TITLE I ESEA PROJECT EVALUATION

Project Number: 64-1

Town Hartford, Connecticut

Prgm Director M. Beatrice Wood

Prgm Evaluator Robert J. Nearine

Descriptive Title of Program Reading Improvement Program

Period of Program:
(x)sch yr only
( )summer only
( )sch yr & sum

Program Funds:
SADC:$135,366
Title I:$177,315
_____:$_____ (Specify any other)

1. Program Participants

Total public school pupils 405

Total nonpublic school pupils -

Grade level breakdown

Pk	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Other
			9	320	76									

2. Economic and educational criteria used to select pupils for services of the program: Pupils attending validated schools were chosen for this program, based on the accompanying criteria.

3. Number and type of staff to whom SADC or Title I funds were paid:

1 Program Director, 3 Reading Consultants, 6 Teachers, 2 Secretaries

4. Principle objectives related to pupils' achievement and attitudes:

See Narrative

5. Description of program activities and services:

See Narrative

6. Evaluation of the principal goals of the program, measures used, results, and an interpretation of what the results mean.

See Narrative

7. Aside from the evaluation made of program objectives, indicate any successful outcomes resulting from Title I or SADC efforts in any town during the past year.

See Narrative

8. Aside from the evaluation made of program objectives, indicate any problems resulting from Title I or SADC efforts in the town during the past year.

See Narrative

9. State the recommendations for the future consideration of the programs. Base the recommendations on the findings and conclusions of this evaluation report.

See Narrative

10. Name(s) of school(s) which participated in program: Arsenal, Clark, Jones, Vine, Waverly, Wish

11. Report the duration in weeks of the direct services to pupils 34

12. Report the full time equivalent (f.t.e.) number of Title I-SADC supported staff who directly taught, tutored, or counseled pupils in the program. Where a staff member directed only one-quarter of the teaching day to program teaching-learning activities, show .25 as the number for that staff member. Also indicate the total program hours of direct teaching, tutoring, or counseling rendered weekly by this staff.

f.t.e. staff number		total teaching hours weekly
(6)	teacher	(30) each
( )	tutor or aide	( )
( )	counselor	( )
(3)	reading consultants (specify other)	( )

13. Program activities were mainly:
( ) in participants' classrooms
(X) outside participants' classrooms

14. Title I funds are provided to serve children from low-income areas regardless of whether they attend public or private schools. If children going to nonpublic schools resided in the school attendance areas validated for Title I, ESEA services in your community, provide the following:

    a. Where Title I services were rendered, indicate the number of children and the name(s) of the nonpublic schools they attended.

    -

    b. Describe the specific services nonpublic school children received.

    -

    c. Indicate the dollar amount of Title I, ESEA funds used for the above services.

    -

15. a. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were promoted to the next grade level at the end of school year 1972-73. 405

    b. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were not promoted to the next grade level at the end of school year 1972-73. 0

16. a. Give the aggregate days of attendance for the school year of children and youth directly served by the project. 20,145

    b. Give the aggregate days of membership for the school year of children and youth directly served by the project. 21,266

17. a. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who remained in school from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973. -

    b. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who withdrew from school but were not transfer withdrawals, from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973. -

    c. List the number of other grade 7-12 youth who were neither dropout withdrawals nor pupils who remained for the full year. -

18. Report the standardized test results for program children on the following pages. Report results so that pre and post-test scores are for the same pupils.

    Page 5 test results are organized to help in a statewide analysis of SADC and Title I. On this page, report either a "total score" or a "single, best predictor score" for the broad areas of reading, math and language where these are available for and germane to the program being offered. Note that group scores have been requested for specific grade levels only.

    Page 6 has been organized for all other test information which cannot be included on page 5.

STANDARDIZED TEST INFORMATION FOR READING, MATH, AND LANGUAGE

(Information reported on forms supplied by the Research Department.)

Town Hartford Proj.# 64-1 Type Program IRIT

Test Instrument Information					Raw Scores and Grade Equivalence			
Gr Lvl for Group Scores	Name of Test	Test Area	Pre & Post Test Forms	No. of Pupils Tested	Time of Pre Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.	Time of Post Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.
Reading								
Gr 1								
Gr 2								
Gr 3	CAT '70	Voc, Comp, Rdg.		78	3.1	A 2.1 1.9	3.9	A 2.9 3.1 3.0
Gr 4	CAT '53	Voc, Comp, Rdg.		23	3.9	W 3.3 3.1	4.9	Y 4.6 4.8 4.7
Gr 5								
Gr 6								
Math								
Gr 1								
Gr 2								
Gr 3								
Gr 4								
Gr 5								
Gr 6								
Language					CA at Pre Test	Mean Scores r.s. / MA	CA at Post Test	Mean Scores r.s. / MA
Pk								
K								

* Record date of testing in grade equivalent units. If the pretest is between September 15 and October 14 for fourth graders, record it as 4.1, for example. If the posttest is between May 15 and June 14, record it as 4.9. If during other months, use the same rationale.

See also enclosed tables. Fourth graders were tested pre and post with forms W and Y. In some cases, forms were reversed or replaced by X.

SAMPLE CONTRACTS

USED

TO DEVELOP SELF-DIRECTION

M. Beatrice Wood

I.R.I.T. Contract with:

GROUP ACTIVITIES	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURS.	FRIDAY
Controlled Reader					
Reader's Digest					
Fun with Words					
Filmstrip					
Listening Skills					
Barnell-Loft					
Worksheets					
INDEPENDENT ACTIVITIES					
S.R.A.					
Puzzle Cards					
Barnell-Loft					
Story Records					
Filmstrip and Tapes					
Fable Cards					
Reading Books					
Language Master					
Games					

INDIVIDUALIZED READING AREA

	GROUP ACTIVITIES								INDEPENDENT ACTIVITIES																					
	Getting Main Idea	Drawing Conclusions	Reading for Concept	Fun With Words	Consonants with 1 sound	Consonant Blends	Vowel Sounds short long	Word Classification	Individualized Reading	What's Missing?	Word Game	Blends Race	Sentence Builder Game	Magic Cards	Language Master	Syllable Count	Story Records	Tape Recorder	Filmstrip Previewer	Study Scope	Rhyming Pictures	Overhead Projector	Split words	Clock Puzzle-Sammy Sun	Dukane Projector Filmstrip	
MONDAY																										
TUESDAY																										
WEDNESDAY																										
THURSDAY																										
FRIDAY																										

NAME_____ DATE_____

NAME_____ DATE_____

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
Dolch Popper Words					
Sight Phrase Cards					
Speed Up (one)					
Speed Up (two)					
Rhyming Puzzle					
Rhyming Pictures					
Sentence Builder					
Story Cards					
Magic Cards					
Aspirations					
See-Quees					
Classification Game					
Creating Stories					
Classification & Opposite Pictures					
Picture Word Builder					
Player					
Tape Recorder					
Overhead Projector					
Language Master					
Record Player					
Filmstrip Projector					
Cassette					
Filmstrip Previewer					
Individual Reading					
Reader's Digest					
Other					

NAME_____ DATE_____

	SEATWORK	READING	R.D.	B.L.	GAMES	MACHINES	OTHERS
MONDAY							
TUESDAY							
WEDNESDAY							
THURSDAY							
FRIDAY							

May 19

NAME_____ WEEK ENDING_____

	Supplementary Activities	Individualized Reading	Independent Activities	Comments
MONDAY				
TUESDAY				
WEDNESDAY				
THURSDAY				
FRIDAY				

5/1971

MARK TWAIN SCHOOL
395 Lyme Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06112

March 23, 1973

To: Chauncey Harris Reading Team:

We, at Mark Twain, are appreciative and grateful to the Chauncey Harris Reading Team under the leadership of Mrs. Beatrice Wood, for the many benefits received by our students.

Your cooperative efforts, harmonious and enthusiastic manner in communicating with us is noteworthy.

The comprehensive profiles on each child will aid us in continuing to meet their individual needs.

Thank you all for making our first experience with an Intensive Reading Team a pleasant and beneficial one for our students and for us.

We will be delighted, if, in the near future, the opportunity for our participation in such a program can be repeated.

Teacher's Signature:

Louise Tinnie
Geraldine C. Minor
Elaine S. Bosch
Wilbur K. Ostrand
Alice Crews
Mrs. C. Wesley
[illegible]
Louise S. Pascoe
Alice L. Lewis

HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Hartford, Connecticut

I.R.I.T. PROGRAM

Teacher Evaluation Form

Name A. Cimochowski Grade _____ School Reading Consultant, Waverly

Date 6-6-73

The number of your pupils who attended the I.R.I.T. Program this cycle. 45

Please answer the following questions in relation to the pupil's standing in your classroom at the beginning of the cycle.

1. What changes have you noticed in the skills of the children attending the I.R.I.T. ? Describe briefly. Am most pleased with the skill development of the children...
2. What changes in the children's attitude toward reading did you notice? Describe briefly. This has to be the greatest! The kids really seem to "enjoy" not only wanting to read but want to learn how to read!
3. What behavioral changes have you noticed? Please specify. I have lauded the changes in teacher attitude — Think some significant changes will take place in Sept. 1973
4. Were you able to visit the I.R.I.T. Program to see it in action?

   Yes ✓ No _____

5. How many pupils remained with you during the A.M. ? —
6. What affect did the I.R.I.T. Program have on the children who remained in your classroom?

   What affect did removing some pupils from your classroom have on your program?

7. How would you improve the I.R.I.T. Program? Describe briefly. "One in every School!"
8. How have the pupil progress reports helped you?

This works well with the HIA set-up... Remaining children did receive more help and the much needed attention.

from Kevin Ray Anderson

Dear reading school

How are you doing? ——— I hope you are fine I still like to read and draw I still want to come to reading school and I want you to ask Mrs lilly can I come back to read school

Love reading school